

## Re: Docket Number TMD-94-00-2

Dear Eileen Stommes:

As a customer of The Onion River Food Co-op in Burlington, Vermont, I am aware of the development of the proposed rules and your request for comments. I respectfully request the USDA withdraw the proposed rules on organic food production and repropose the rules based on the recommendations of the NOSB. The Board went to historic lengths to create an open and inclusive process that involved thousands of citizens, including those who are most informed about, and most affected by, this issue.

I urge you to give us a meaningful choice about how our food is produced and to maintain the integrity of organic agriculture in the final rules. I strongly believe that the proposed rules are *not compatible or consistent with long-established organic principles*. The following are some of the many aspects of USDA's proposed standards which do not belong under the organic label:

- Genetically engineered organisms and materials (sections 205.22, 205.26, 205.8, 205.9, 205.12, 205.16)  
Section 205.2 should be replaced by NOSB definition
- "Biosolids," (section 205.22)
- "Ionizing radiation" (Irradiation)

The following are some of the NOSB recommendations I ask you to please restore:

- Allow private certification organizations to have a higher standard (sections 205.13, 205.14, 205.15)
- Not price the small private certifiers and farmers out of the organic industry (sections 205.31, 205.421, 205.422, 205.423, 205.424)
- Follow NOSB recommended standards for livestock (sections 205.13, 205.15, 205.22, 205.24)

Name (Print):

Sincerely,

Address: